

## **REMARKS**

Concerning claim 1, the office action indicates that “after the treatment of the glass sheets in this manner they are stacked in a box (corresponding to the claimed ‘electrostatically adhering said first sheet to a second glass sheet/forming a composite of two electrostatically adhered glass sheets’).” To the contrary, there is no suggestion whatsoever that the glass sheets are adhered to one another. Instead, the only suggestion in the reference is that the glass sheets have adhered to them electrostatically a layer of flour.

In order for this limitation to be met inherently, it must be necessarily the case that the charge applied to adhere the flour is sufficient to adhere the sheets, despite the imposition of the flour between the sheets. This would not seem to be the case since the static charge is applied to the upper surface of each sheet. The lower surfaces of the sheets are not electrostatically charged and, therefore, there is no reason to believe that one sheet stacked above another would be electrostatically adhered to the other because the opposed surfaces are not both electrostatically charged (or oppositely charged). Moreover, it is not necessarily the case that they would be attracted to one another even if they were both oppositely charged because of the intervening dielectric flour layer.

The office action goes on to suggest that “while Gwyn may not specifically state that the combined sheets are further processed and separated, these limitations are not deemed to impart a patentable distinction over Gwyn since it follows that the sheets would obviously be transported and delivered (corresponding to the claimed ‘processing’) to their final destination where they would be unpacked (which would ultimately involve separating/peeling the sheets apart) for a particular use.” However, there is no reason to believe that the sheets are even adhered and, even if they were adhered electrostatically, there is no reason that they are processed while the electrostatic charge is applied.

Again, in order to be inherent, the result must necessarily be attained. However, the amount of charge that Gwyn applies is only sufficient to remain on the surface “for ten minutes or more.” See column 4, line 10. Thus, by the time the box has reached a destination, more than likely, if not certainly, the charge would long be gone. Thus, the postulated processing in a charged state never exists. The separation of the sheets which the Examiner suggests to be processing would be long after any charge had been dissipated. Moreover, there is no reason to

believe that the bottom surface of the upper sheet would be electrostatically adhered to the upper surface of the lower sheet since the lower surface of the upper sheet was never charged.


For all of these reasons, reconsideration of rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.  
On the same analysis, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

With respect to the argument that a corona source to charge sheets is a conventional practice, it is not believed that any reference teaches using a corona source to charge a glass sheet pursuant to claims 1 and 8. Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In view of these remarks, the application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 23, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]